



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/665,484	09/22/2003	Atsuhisa Saitoh	243004US2	6903
22850	7590	01/26/2009		
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314				
EXAMINER				
TO, BAOTRAN N				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2435				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
01/26/2009		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com

oblonpat@oblon.com

jgardner@oblon.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/665,484

Applicant(s)

SAITOH ET AL.

Examiner

Baotran N. To

Art Unit

2435

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 November 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-69 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 34-58, 63, 66 and 69 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33, 59-62, 64, 65, 67 and 68 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB08)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office action is in response Applicant's Amendment filed 11/07/2008.
Claims 34-58, 63, 66, and 69 are withdrawn.
Claims 1-33, 59-62, 64-65, 67 and 68 have been examined and rejected.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 11/07/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant appears to argue that Furukawa fails to teach or suggest "an operation requirement selection unit that selects one operation requirement including control information of operations allowed in connection with each type of system specified according to identification information, said system performing processing on the document. In other words, in Furukawa, processes can be performed on a document based upon the user identification information, i.e. certain permissions are tied to a specific user. In contrast, in Applicants' Claim 1, operations on a document are controlled based on a document's association with a particular type of system. Thus, in Applicants' invention, it is possible to flexibly perform comprehensive management functions and control specific processing functions of a specific document" (Page 2 of Remarks).

This argument is not persuasive because Furukawa expressly discloses the above limitations in figure 7 such as [0050] Step S607 : When the access permit of the user of self-apparatus is carried out from the computer apparatus 120 as a result of

distinction of Step S606, a user, **Operations** (for example, **copy operation, FAX transmission operation, FAX reception print operation, etc.**) for which it asks with the composite machine 110 (1) are performed using the indicator 209 or the final controlling element 210. This operation information is incorporated into CPU201 in apparatus. [0051]Step S608: **The operation information** (information including the operation name which shows operation classification) of the user who incorporated CPU201 at Step S607, The user's User Information (information acquired at Step S602) and the information (refer to above- mentioned drawing 6) on the machine name (NAME) 510 which shows self-apparatus are transmitted to the computer apparatus 120 which is a server machine via LAN130. [0052]Step S609: and CPU201 wait for the response from the computer apparatus 120 to the information transmitted at Step S608.[0054]Step S610: **When the information which shows operation permission or disapproval from the computer apparatus 120 to the composite machine machine 110 (1) is returned, in the composite machine machine 110 (1) CPU201, It is distinguished whether using the returned information, the permission was granted to the operation which the user of self-apparatus performed.** As a result of this distinction, when operation permission is carried out, it progresses to Step S611, and when that is not right, it progresses to Step S613. [0055]Step S611: **When a permission is granted from the computer apparatus 120 to the operation which the user of self-apparatus performed as a result of distinction of Step S610, CPU201 performs motion control of the whole self-apparatus for the operation based on the above-mentioned operation.**

Furthermore, Examiner would like to point out that processes can be performed not only based upon the user identification information, but also based on the information on machine name which identifies each type of the system in paragraph [0051] Step S608: **The operation information (information including the operation name which shows operation classification) of the user who incorporated CPU201 at Step S607, The user's User Information (information acquired at Step S602) and the information (refer to above- mentioned drawing 6) on the machine name (NAME) 510 which shows self-apparatus are transmitted to the computer apparatus 120 which is a server machine via LAN130.** Therefore, Furukawa discloses the above limitations.

For at least the above reasons, the rejection for Claims 1-33, 59-62, 64, 65, 67 and 68 is maintained.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 11/24/2008. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-33, 59-62, 64, 65, 67 and 68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Furukawa (JP 2000357064 A) hereinafter Furukawa cited in IDS dated 02/17/2004 in view of Shimomura et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0095432 A1) hereinafter Shimomura.

Regarding Claims 1, 59, 64 and 67, Furukawa discloses an image forming device comprising:

- an operation requirement selection unit that selects one operation requirement including control information of operations allowed in connection with each type of system specified according to identification information, said system performing processing on the document (paragraphs 0050-0055); and

- an operation control unit that controls an execution of a predetermined operation to be performed on the document according to the operation requirement selected by said operation requirement selection unit (paragraphs 0050-0055).

Furukawa does not disclose an identification information reading unit that reads identification information of a document.

However, Shimomura discloses an identification information reading unit that reads identification information of a document (Figures 1- 2, paragraph 0036).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated Shimomura's invention within Furukawa to include an identification information reading unit that reads identification information of a document. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to

do so because it would manage a large number of documents while ensuring the security at various levels (Shimomura, paragraph 0002).

Regarding Claims 17, 61, 65 and 68, Furukawa discloses an image forming device comprising:

an operation requirement selection unit that selects one operation requirement including control information of operations allowed in connection with each type of system specified according to identification information, said system performing processing on the document (paragraphs 0050-0055); and

an operation control unit that controls an execution of a predetermined operation to be performed on the document according to the operation requirement selected by said operation requirement selection unit (paragraphs 0050-0055).

Furukawa does not disclose a document profile acquisition unit that transmits identification information read from a document to an external server providing a document profile, and thereby receiving said document profile from said external server.

However, Shimomura discloses a document profile acquisition unit that transmits identification information read from a document to an external server providing a document profile, and thereby receiving said document profile from said external server (Figures 1- 2, paragraph 0036).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated Shimomura's invention within Furukawa to include a document profile acquisition unit that transmits identification

information read from a document to an external server providing a document profile, and thereby receiving said document profile from said external server. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so because it would manage a large number of documents while ensuring the security at various levels (Shimomura, paragraph 0002).

Regarding Claims 2 and 18, Furukawa and Shimomura disclose the limitations of claim 1 above. Furukawa and Shimomura further disclose wherein said operation requirement is a requirement regarding security for said document (Furukawa, paragraph 0050 and Shimomura, paragraph 0026).

Regarding Claims 3 and 19, Furukawa and Shimomura disclose the limitations of claim 1 above. Furukawa and Shimomura further disclose wherein said predetermined operation is forming an image by electronic data (Furukawa, paragraphs 0050-0055).

Regarding Claims 4 and 20, Furukawa and Shimomura disclose the limitations of claim 1 above Furukawa and Shimomura further disclose wherein said predetermined operation is printing said document on a paper (Furukawa, paragraph 0021).

Regarding Claims 5 and 21, Furukawa and Shimomura disclose the limitations of claim 1 above Furukawa and Shimomura further disclose wherein said identification information reading unit includes: an identification information recognition unit that

recognizes data acquired by performing a predetermined reading operation with respect to said document, as said identification information; a document profile management unit that relates and manages said identification information and a document profile; and a document profile acquisition unit that requires said document profile related to said identification information recognized by said identification information recognition part by referring to said document profile management part (Furukawa, paragraphs 0019-0080 and Shimomura, paragraphs 0018-0059).

Regarding Claims 6 and 22, Furukawa and Shimomura disclose the limitations of claim 5 above. Furukawa and Shimomura further disclose wherein said predetermined reading operation reads either a bar code, a two-dimensional code or a magnetic code printed on said document, or an RFID provided on said document so as to recognize the read data as said identification information when said document is a paper (Furukawa, paragraph 0021).

Regarding Claims 7 and 23, Furukawa and Shimomura disclose the limitations of claim 5 above. Furukawa and Shimomura further disclose wherein said predetermined reading operation recognizes either a bar code, a two-dimensional code, numerical information, text information or a dot pattern from electronic image data generated by reading said document, as said identification information (Furukawa, paragraphs 0019-0080 and Shimomura, paragraphs 0018-0059).

Regarding Claims 8 and 25, Furukawa and Shimomura disclose the limitations of claim 1 above. Furukawa and Shimomura further disclose a user profile acquisition unit that acquires a user profile regarding a user requesting said predetermined operation (Furukawa, paragraph 0041).

Regarding Claims 9 and 26, Furukawa and Shimomura disclose the limitations of claim 8 above. Furukawa and Shimomura further disclose wherein said user profile acquisition unit includes: a user identification information acquisition unit that acquires user identification information identifying said user from another user; a user profile management unit that relates and manages said user identification information and said user profile; a user authentication unit that authenticates said user according to said user identification information; and a user profile reading unit that acquires said user profile related to said user identification information acquired by said user identification information acquisition part by referring to said user profile management unit according to a result of the authentication by said user authentication unit (Furukawa, paragraphs 0019-0080 and Shimomura, paragraphs 0018-0059).

Regarding Claims 10 and 27, Furukawa and Shimomura disclose the limitations of claim 8 above. Furukawa and Shimomura further disclose wherein said user profile acquisition unit includes: a user identification information acquisition unit that acquires user identification information identifying said user from another user; and a user profile request unit that requests said user profile from an external server authenticating said

user and providing said user profile (Furukawa, paragraphs 0019-0080 and Shimomura, paragraphs 0018-0059).

Regarding Claims 11, 28 and 60, Furukawa and Shimomura disclose the limitations of claim 1 above. Furukawa and Shimomura further disclose an operation requirement judgment unit that judges whether or not said operation requirement is feasible; and an operation prohibition unit that prohibits said predetermined operation when a result of the judgment by said operation requirement judgment unit indicates that said operation requirement is not feasible (Furukawa, paragraphs 0019-0080 and Shimomura, paragraphs 0018-0059).

Regarding Claims 12 and 29, Furukawa and Shimomura disclose the limitations of claim 1 above. Furukawa and Shimomura further disclose wherein said operation requirement requires embedding an electronic watermark upon executing said predetermined operation with respect to said document (Furukawa, paragraphs 0019-0080 and Shimomura, paragraphs 0018-0059).

Regarding Claims 13 and 30, Furukawa and Shimomura disclose the limitations of claim 1 above. Furukawa and Shimomura further disclose wherein said operation requirement requires embedding a displayable label upon executing said predetermined operation with respect to said document (Furukawa, paragraphs 0019-0080 and Shimomura, paragraphs 0018-0059).

Regarding Claims 14 and 31, Furukawa and Shimomura disclose the limitations of claim 9 above. Furukawa and Shimomura further disclose wherein said operation requirement requires embedding a displayable label upon executing said predetermined operation with respect to said document, and said displayable label contains at least authentication data of said user requesting said predetermined operation, and a timestamp upon requesting said predetermined operation (Furukawa, paragraphs 0019-0080 and Shimomura, paragraphs 0018-0059).

Regarding Claims 15 and 32, Furukawa and Shimomura disclose the limitations of claim 9 above. Furukawa and Shimomura further disclose wherein said operation requirement requires recording at least authentication data of said user requesting said predetermined operation, document data of said document generated by said predetermined operation, and a timestamp upon requesting said predetermined operation (Furukawa, paragraphs 0019-0080 and Shimomura, paragraphs 0018-0059).

Regarding Claims 16 and 33, Furukawa and Shimomura disclose the limitations of claim 1 above. Furukawa and Shimomura further disclose a delivery unit that delivers document data via a network, the document data being generated by executing said predetermined operation with satisfying said operation requirement enabling a network delivery of said document (Furukawa, paragraphs 0019-0080 and Shimomura, paragraphs 0018-0059).

Regarding Claims 24 and 62, Furukawa and Shimomura disclose the limitations of claim 23 above. Furukawa and Shimomura further disclose wherein said document profile acquisition unit includes a portion acquisition part acquiring a predetermined portion representing a portion or all of said electronic image data, wherein said communication unit transmits said predetermined portion of said electronic image data to said external server, and receives said document profile from said external server (Furukawa, paragraphs 0019-0080 and Shimomura, paragraphs 0018-0059).

Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Baotran N. To whose telephone number is (571)272-8156. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 to 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Y. Vu can be reached on 571-272-3859. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/B. N. T./
Examiner, Art Unit 2435
/Kimyen Vu/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2435